



THE APPLICATION OF SINCLAIR & COULTHARD'S IRF PATTERN ON TEACHERS' ELICITATION IN SPEAKING CLASS

Nour Ayouni ¹

Iskandarmuda University, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study describes the pattern of teachers' elicitation in speaking class of English Department of Ar-raniry Islamic State University which focuses on investigating the pattern of elicitation exchange by using Sinclair & Coulthard's (S&C) IRF model. The participants of this study were five lecturers of speaking classes and hence they were video-recorded and transcribed in order to identify and analyze each turn of elicitation exchange which is then fit to S&C's IRF pattern. Qualitative method was employed in this study where the data were obtained from observation and interview by means of video recorder, field-notes, observation sheet and interview guide. Technique of data analysis was followed Miles' & Huberman's model including data reduction, data display, and conclusion. From the results, it was found that the pattern of the elicitation exchange in speaking class covers 16 patterns including IRF original structure and the combination with Bound Initiation (Ib).

Keywords: *IRF pattern, elicitation pattern, teachers' elicitation, bound initiation*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is a primary skill for language learning and it indicates students' success in acquiring a new language. As Goh & Burns (2012) stated, the mastery of speaking in English is a priority for second language learners. Their success in language learning is often evaluated on the basis of how good their spoken language proficiency is. Absolutely, having adequate skill in speaking which can be developed through day-to-day classroom interaction is very important.

¹ Corresponding author: nurayouni86@gmail.com

Unfortunately, based on the researcher's preliminary study in a speaking class at English Department of Ar-raniry Islamic State University, students had limited chance to speak in the classroom where they were not invited to involve in the teacher-students interaction. This is in line what Richards and Farrel (2011) said that students have only restricted opportunities to participate in the communicative and interactive use of language and hence have restricted opportunities of language learning. As a consequence, they tend to be silent and listen to most teacher talk conducted by the lecturers in speaking class. Due to this, students could not practice some components such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, language function, and also fluency of their English speaking.

To solve this problem, teachers can actually teach the speaking skill through teachers' elicitation in the classroom where students are always invited to verbally respond to teachers' questions. This makes interactive communication between teachers and students to facilitate learners for practicing English language more actively. Lindsay (as cited in Syauqi, 2011) proposed that through teachers' elicitation, speaking is introduced through three stages: elicitation of appropriate functional language, intensive oral practice, and developing oral fluency. Through this method, moreover, students can train all language aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, and vocabulary. Nunan (1999) also emphasized that elicitation is a procedure by which teachers stimulate students to produce sample of the structure, function, and vocabulary item being taught. Therefore, elicitation is essential to promote students' speaking skill.

The term *elicitation* is firstly introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 to describe utterance which requests for verbal response in the classroom (Ramiro, 2002). In language classroom, elicitation is defined as teachers' procedure to stimulate students to produce sample of structure or vocabulary being taught (Nunan, 1999). It is a basic technique in the classroom to draw things from students especially by questions instead of explanation in order to actively engage them in learning process (Scrivener, 2012). Meanwhile, IRF pattern, which is commonly known as Initiation-Response-Feedback, is also firstly developed by Sinclair and Coulthard to show interaction in the classroom (Nicholson, 2014). This is a powerful model to allow teachers or researchers to evaluate communication in the classroom objectively.

Yu (2009) in her analysis of English classroom discourse of in three college English intensive reading classes of non-English students. By

using IRF framework, the result revealed that elicitation exchange during the lesson consisted of S&C's original model and collaboration with a bound initiation (Ib) where the teacher had to re-initiate the exchange because of students' lack of English proficiency. The study found that S&C's IRF Model can be applied in English classroom that there were quite a lot of patterns agreeing the model and IRF patterns of elicitation exchange accounted for the most proportion of all discourse with percentage 35.42%. Meanwhile, others contains IR pattern 21.88%, IIRF 16.67%, and I pattern 13.54%. These patterns were inconsistent with S&C's IRF model because of teachers' dominance over the class and students' silence.

IRF cycle was also analyzed by Hadley (2010) in terms of teachers' questions in Initiation move (I), students' response (R), and teachers' feedback (F). It was found that display question was mostly used by the teachers in the classroom which appeared commonly in Initiation (I) move. Further, recast was the most frequent feedback employed by the teachers to evaluate students' language use which occurred repeatedly in F move. In sum, teachers' question in Initiation was very effective to invite students to speak and feedback of recast was also useful to correct their ill-form utterances.

Regarding all above discussion, the researcher is therefore interested to conduct a qualitative-quantitative study on analyzing IRF pattern of teachers' elicitation in speaking class. Specifically, this study explores the pattern of teacher's elicitation in speaking class of English Department of Ar-raniry Islamic State University. This further will describe how teacher-student interaction is organized among the structures and turns.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Speaking Skill

Speaking is a way of conveying ideas, expressing feeling and sharing information by using spoken language which is an essential mean for daily communication. It is also used as a parameter of the successful acquisition of speaking skill. As Nunan (1999, p. 225) states "If listening is the Cinderella skill in second language learning, then speaking is the overbearing elder sister. The ability to function in another language is generally characterized in terms of being able to speak that language". Thus, students' mastery of English is often evaluated by the ability to speak it. That is why speaking as one of the language skills become a

primary skill to learn. It is at very heart of what it means to be able to use a foreign language (Luoma, 1999).

To be proficient in speaking, several components need to be noted on by both students and teachers when doing an assessment. Nunan (1999) asked what someone needs to know and be able to do in order to be able to speak in another language. Definitely, he or she needs to know how to articulate sounds in comprehensible manner, adequate vocabulary, and syntax mastery. Hence, grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation are some elements that students need to apply appropriately in their speaking.

Ultimately, those aspects can be trained through kinds of speaking activities: transactional and interpersonal. Transactional functions to convey information and facilitate the exchange of goods and services (Harmer, 2007). Meanwhile, according to Nunan (1999, p. 228), interpersonal has main purpose to maintain social relationship. Students are expected to be able to use English in both genres. Speaking tasks in the classroom may be served in various activities so that they can experience language use in different contexts and situation. For instance, the lecturer can elicit ideas from students to build a dialogue by means of pictures or other visual aids. Therefore, the dialogue is developed by themselves instead of presenting it for them.

Definition of Elicitation

The term *elicitation* is firstly introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 to describe utterances in the classroom which elicit verbal responses (Ramiro, 2002). Further, Tsui (as cited in Jafari 2014, p. 3) adopted this term and defined it as any utterance whose function is to elicit an obligatory verbal response. In language classroom, elicitation is to encourage students' speaking which can in turn be used as a tool of evaluation toward their speaking ability. Nunan (1999) describes that elicitation is a procedure by which teachers stimulate students to produce sample of the structure, function, and vocabulary items being taught.

It is a standard procedure for teachers to present the word meaning, for example by showing a picture and asking them to supply the form (Thornburry, 2013). New words can be effectively presented by elicitation and that's why it is very important to introduce vocabulary (Harmer, 2007). Teachers commonly use this technique to ask students to give information rather than provide it for them. Eliciting is a technique of drawing things from students, generally by asking questions, instead of using teacher explanation. It leads to greater

involvement, encourage thinking, and pushes students to self discoveries (Scrivener, 2012).

Techniques for Elicitation

Elicitation takes the biggest part of classroom interaction. It is commonly used to actively involve students in the teaching and learning process. Hence, the most common exchange in the classroom is eliciting exchange (Dailey, 2010). Obviously, it is very beneficial for language learning because it can facilitate students' speaking and provide large opportunity of language practice. To obtain students' verbal response, different kind of elicitation technique can be employed in speaking class such as asking question or providing stimulus e.g. picture, gestures, and setting up the discussion (Chitravelu, Sithamparan, & Choon, 2005).

Question is the most popular way for lecturers to get students' verbal response. Elicitation entails asking questions and it is one of the principal ways in which teachers can control the classroom discourse (Alsubaie, 2015). In teaching speaking, questions are very often posed by teachers in order to make students speak and to check their understanding. In this case, WH questions should be posed more often to which the students can provide a long answer and have more opportunities for practicing the target language.

Moreover, gapped sentences on the board can be employed to elicit various things from students. This technique leads them to discover something, encourage thinking, and guide discovery (Scrivener, 2012). This makes them alerted to keep thinking and searching for answer to fill in the gap. Additionally, Coskun (2010) proposed that correct form can be directly elicited from students by pausing to allow them to complete an utterance such as "He is good...?". This provokes their curiosity and attention to give an expected answer. Some features like grammatical form, vocabulary, and how they pronounce words can be identified from their response.

Alternatively, non-verbal language can be utilized as well. Thus, miming, gestures, facial expression, and body language are usually exploited to elicit words and language structure (Delvia, Jufri, & Yuli 2013). This provides students clues so that they will be easier to find appropriate responses. Beside, when effectively generated, eliciting by using gesture makes learning more interesting. It avoids students from being bored because their teachers use various technique in inviting them to speak.

In a nutshell, elicitation techniques include both verbal and nonverbal. It is done mainly using questions to which students give an answer and is evaluated by their teacher. Body language or gesture, gapped sentence, and strategic pausing can also be implemented to elicit their responses.

Types of Elicitation

The researcher has based the analysis of this study on Tsui's (1995) classification of elicitation which is function-based. Tsui adopted the term *elicitation* from Sinclair and Coulthard who for the first time use it to refer to any utterances which expect students' verbal responses. She further classified it into six types as appear in the following (Jafari, 2013):

1) Elicit:inform

It invites students to supply a piece of information. This kind of elicitation can be realized by using WH questions, yes/no question, alternative question, and indirect question.

2) Elicit:confirm

This subcategory invites students to confirm teachers' assumption, for example to confirm whether they have understood the materials given or not. It can be realized by tag interrogative, declarative, and negative polar question.

3) Elicit:agree

This functions to ask students' agreement towards teacher's assumption which is self-evidently true. It can be applied by using tag question.

4) Elicit:commit

This kind of elicitation is to elicit commitment from students. Yes/no question and WH interrogative may be used in this type of elicitation.

5) Elicit:repeat

This category prospects a repetition of the utterance preceding elicitation. It invites students to repeat their response because the teacher has not heard it clearly. It is identified by WH questions, utterances like "say it again, pardon?, sorry?, could you repeat? or huh?

6) Elicit: clarify

It requests for students' repetition of previous utterance because it is incorrect, so that they will be aware of their mistake. It is known by WH interrogative or high key repetition of a word or phrase in the preceding utterance.

Effective Elicitation

The use of elicitation in speaking class is aimed at motivating them to speak and train their use of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency. Due to this, some steps must be taken into account to realize successful elicitations. Scrivener (2012) suggested several important points to apply effective eliciting as follow:

- a. Make sure the class can hear both the question and the answer. It is important that everyone can hear answers given by other students.
- b. Use a natural sounding. Questions sound more inviting if it sounds like you really search for the answer.
- c. Consider a wait-time where it allows students to think. Don't hurry them and don't answer your own question.
- d. Questions can be nominated. Ask the questions by calling out their name one by one. If a student can not provide the answer, ask another one.

In addition, according to Darn (2010) elicitation can be done effectively by following some suggestions below:

- a. Don't ask students to repeat the incorrect answer, but ask different students to repeat the correct one. This helps them remember.
- b. Give feedback for each answer with comments or gesture because it can encourage and motivate them to learn more.
- c. Eliciting is designed to find out what students have already known. So, they should be provided with sufficient context and information.
- d. Use more guided question to lead students to an expected response.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Elicitation

There are many advantages of elicitation in the second language classroom such as:

- a. It makes students more attentive to the topic being presented by teachers.
- b. It helps teachers to find out how well they apply language structure, vocabulary, and appropriate pronunciation in speaking.
- c. It maximises speaking opportunities

- d. It is to check students' understanding.

However, if overused, elicitation techniques will entail some drawbacks as suggested by Case (2009):

- a. Eliciting can just be a wasting-time procedure.
- b. An active student can dominate the class to answer all of elicitation.
- c. If they don't have any idea, elicitation can be met by silence.
- d. Eliciting will make boring when they get repetitive questions.

Sinclair and Coulthard's (S&C) IRF Pattern

This study is based on this framework to examine the pattern of elicitation. Hence, the pattern of elicitation exchange of speaking classes observed in this study refers to S&C's IRF model consisting of Initiation, Response, and Follow-up. This analytical tool is used to analyze each turn in the eliciting sequence which is jointly constructed by both teachers and students.

According to Waring (2009), a common practice in classroom discourse is the IRF sequence. Its application to a language class gives a huge understanding of how the target language is acquired through every day speaking in the classroom. Students' language learning is facilitated in this common exchange known as IRF. In accordance with this, Nicholson (2014) also stated that this pattern is the most frequently occurring discourse structure found in classroom all over the world. In speaking class, teachers and students are often involved in this format in which the former keeps asking the latter questions to elicit language use, and hence, the latter will be compelled to speak in the target language. It is the most common feature of teacher-student interaction found in the classroom and is often mentioned in studies on classroom interaction (Butterfield & Bhatta, 2015).

S&C's IRF structure was devised in 1975 and slightly revised in 1992 (Yu, 2009). It provides information for teachers or researchers about how the target language is developed through interaction which is structurally formed in the classroom. This model is powerful which allows researchers to evaluate communication which happens in the classroom (Nicholson, 2014). Taking it as the basis, the analysis is focused on elicitation which is the most frequent type of teaching exchange during the lesson. Automatically, in language teaching, this makes it as the familiar sequence of teacher-student turn-taking (Hadley, 2010). This cycle involves teacher's asking questions, students' response, and teacher's followed-up with feedback or evaluation.

Therefore, this structure is valuable for teachers to control and evaluate the students' language use. Consequently, it is very important to apply this model to elicit exchanges in speaking class. Therefore, each part of elicitation unit which is called *move* (McCarthy, 1991, p. 14) is analyzed by using S&C IRF pattern. More precisely, the three moves of elicitation sequence are referred to as initiation (I), response (R), and Follow-up (F). However, not all teacher-student sequential interactions have all moves. They may be, at least, formed by two moves, namely initiation and response (Yu, 2009). Each move will be respectively explained as follow:

Initiation

Sinclair and Coulthard (as quoted in Dailey, 2010) explained that the purpose of initiation move is to elicit a fact. It is the phase where a teacher usually asks a question to request students' verbal responses. This act forms an eliciting exchange which is always initiated by teachers' elicitation. Hence, elicitation is one of the common acts in the opening move of an exchange (Nicholson, 2014). As previously stated, elicitation can be verbal and non-verbal language. Accordingly, students' speaking which is triggered by teacher's initiation is categorized as elicitation which includes questions, gesture, gap sentence, or strategic pausing.

Response

After teacher's initiation, the sequence is then followed by student's response. This second part is students' turn by responding to the questions and producing an answer (Al-Garawi, 2005). Students' response in second language classroom shows their comprehension related to grammatical forms, words usage, and their pronunciation. Often, in speaking class they give opinion, express ideas, or supply some information to respond the lecturers' elicitation. This part is where they can perform their English speaking. Then, it will be evaluated in the follow-up move by teachers. Most of their responses receive some kind of feedback from teachers (Pearson, 2016).

Follow-up

The third turn in IRF is follow-up move which contains comments, feedback or evaluation on students' response. Pearson (2016) asserted that feedback is an essential aspect of the IRF exchange because it enables students to know whether their response has been accepted or

not. Teachers' constantly assess the appropriateness of their utterance and giving them feedback. They need to know whether there is a mistake or an error in their speaking so that they will not do the same. Also, Dailey (2010) stated that follow-up move is considered vital in telling students if they have done what the teacher wanted them to do. Therefore, this closing phase is to evaluate students' utterance as response for teachers' elicitation. It generally aims to acknowledge the outcome of an exchange (Jafari, 2013).

There are three types of feedback listed by Panova and Lyster (in Hadley, 2010) consisting of back channeling, repetition, and recast. Back channeling includes comments such as *uh*, *yeah*, *really* and grunts to indicate success or failure. Repetition is repeating the whole or part of students' utterance and it will be more effective if it is added new information. Whereas, recast is implicit reformulation of student's error or providing correction without directly telling them that the response was incorrect.

In speaking class where students have low English proficiency, lecturers sometimes do not get a response or get wrong answer from students. For this reason, re-initiation (prompts, nomination, and clue) is expected to appear. Thus, he can repeat or rephrase the question, move to another student (nomination), or give clues to elicit a correct response (Yu, 2009). These acts are called bound initiation which is realized in "Ib" and it expands the IRF structure. Bound teaching exchange has more complex sequence since it is attached to the preceding exchange and always initiated by an elicitation (Jones, 2009).

The combination of IRF pattern with bound initiation (Ib) describes how students learn to speak through elicitation exchange and the teacher keeps making effort to stimulate their speaking by reformulating his or her elicitation, asking to another student, or providing some clues so that it will be easier to find the answer.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This descriptive study was done by using qualitative method which entails description of classroom behaviours and classification (Chaudron, 1988). This study was conducted at English Department of Ar-raniry Islamic State University (*UIN Ar-raniry*). Five lecturers who taught speaking unit took part as research participants. Hence, five speaking classes with two meetings for each were observed and recorded from November 12, 2016 to December 10, 2016. The ten teaching

sessions were transcribed and used to analyze IRF pattern of teachers' elicitation. Some instruments were employed such as observation sheet, interview guide, and field note in collecting the data.

Technique of Data Collection

The data were mainly collected by observation. Additionally, interview was implemented as secondary data which supported observation findings. Techniques of data collection from observation included recording, transcribing, observation sheet, and field note. Recording serves as a potential and rich source of data because it can provide samples of actual teaching (Richards & Nunan, 1990). Therefore, 10 speaking classes were audio-video recorded for the analysis.

Next, transcribing was done to change recorded data into written form. One advantage that transcript has over video or audio material is that it permits detailed inspection and analysis more easily. Apparently, they must be in conjunction with transcripts (Richards & Nunan, 1990). Further, observation sheet was filled to indicate the occurrence of types of elicitation during observations. Field notes were also taken to cover some information unfolding as the teaching-learning processes occurred. This observational field note contained details such as name of the class, semester, time, topic, number of students, setting arrangement.

In addition to observation, the researcher interviewed 2 lecturers as research participants to get some information about elicitation in speaking class. Hence, some questions were asked to reflect on their implementation of elicitation in teaching speaking. Interview which was done after observation was also recorded to avoid possible misunderstanding and transcribed to ease the analysis.

Technique of Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process where the researcher analyzes the collected data to be arranged, organized, and managed to enable him or her to draw a conclusion. For this study, data analysis was accomplished in two stages; during-data collection and post-data collection. Therefore, the technique of data analysis followed in during-data collection was Miles and Huberman's model (1992) which includes data reduction, data display, and conclusion/verification.

Data reduction is the phase where the raw data were reduced for choosing the main data, focusing on important ones, and searching for the concepts and model by reviewing the result of observation and

reading the interview findings. This activity allows the researcher to decide whether the data is needed or not. Moreover, data display is the next stage which serves to display the observation and interview findings. After fitting the transcripts into S&C's IRF model, the data were displayed with some examples taken from the entire data and shown in the discussion. Finally, meaning and interpretation were given in conclusion and verification stage. In this section, the researcher found out the answer for research question.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After following some techniques of data collection and analysis, a significant number of teachers' elicitation exchanges were analyzed based on S&C's IRF structure. The result shows that almost all elicitation exchanges were suitable for S&C's IRF model which consists of original structure (IRF) and combination with bound exchange with Ib slots. In the following is the discussion with some examples, while others are presented in appendices

The Pattern of Teachers' Elicitation Exchange in Speaking Class

The transcriptions have been also incorporated into Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF pattern. Using this framework, teacher-students interaction in eliciting exchange is discussed line by line. As a result, some patterns were found to follow IRF original model and consisted of combination with bound initiation (Ib). They will be presented in the discussion below:

A. IR

1.1 T: Yes the amount of the money they have to pay. (I)

To whom?

Is that cheap or expensive?

Ss: Expensive. (R)

IR pattern only has lecture's initiation and students' response in the sequence. It was clearly drawn in the above extract where after getting response, the lecturer did not either evaluate it or start a new elicitation to show that it is acceptable or not. More detail, students' answer "expensive" for teacher's elicitation "is that cheap or expensive?" is not followed by the feedback or any comment. However, it was fit the S&C's

IRF model where the exchange has at least two moves, I and R (Yu, 2009).

B. IF

2.1 T: **How about this?** (I)

Ss: (Silent)

T: Look. We call this “weights”. (pronounce correctly) (F)

This elicitation exchange is initiated by the lecturer by asking “How about this?”. The students failed to answer this question due to lack of vocabulary. Hence, it gives the pattern IF with the lecturer’s response being a follow-up move. It means that the pattern only includes the teacher’s turns and excludes students’ response.

C. IRF

3.1 T: You. **Okay what happen in the story?** (I)

Sf: He sells sport suits and sport things. (R)

T: **Okay. What are they doing in that sport store?** (F/I)

Sf: Buy the suits. (R)

T: **Why...why they want the suits?** (F/I)

Sf: Because they want to train in gym. (R)

T: **Why are they interesting in going to the gym?** (F/I)

Sf: Because they eat a lot. (R)

T: **What do they see here?** (F/I)

Sf: Advertisement. (R)

T: Advertisement about the gym. **They visit the gym first or going to the store first?** (F/I)

Sf: Go to the gym first. (R)

T: Okay. (F)

The complete pattern of IRF model was organized respectively around this eliciting exchanges. Each was initiated by WH question to elicit information from the students. It can be seen that students always provided response for each teacher’s elicitation and received some kinds of feedback such as “okay” as pointed in line 3 and 12, and restament of answer as shown in line 11. These feedbacks were in line with those listed by Panova and Lyster (quoted in Hadley, 2010, p. 5).

D. IRF with Bound Initiation (Ib)

As stated before, Ib expands the IRF pattern with single or some slots in elicitation exchange. From the analysis, some modifications of bound initiation (re-initiation, nomination, clue) appeared in some structures as presented in the following extracts:

4.1 T: Okay. Alright. **Do you feel angry to see the girl in the video?** (I)

Sf: Aaa...

T: When you see the video, do you feel angry? (Ib)

Sf: Yes. (R)

T: Okay. Yes. **Why?** (F/I)

The data reveals that a yes/no question “Do you feel angry to see the girl in the video?” was raised initially in the exchange. Then, the lecturer reinitiated by reformulating the question because the student could not answer his previous elicitation. Afterward, this re-initiation obtained “yes” answer and was concluded by feedback “Okay”. Hence, in this exchange, Ib is in form of rephrasing the question.

4.2 T: **What from the sheep? The meat from the sheep?** (I)

Ss: Meat..meat (R)

T: Beef is from the cow. From the sheep? (Ib)

Ss: Aaa...

T: *Daging kambing apa namanya?* What is in English language? How to say *daging kambing* in English? (Ib)

Ss: Meat..lamb...lamb (R)

T: Lamb. It is lamb. *Dong* is very so many homonyms. *Dong* means stop, ***dong* mean...aaa...what else?** (F/I)

This exchange was initiated by a teacher's elicitation “What from the sheep?”. The two Ib slots were structured respectively to elicit correct response. Incorrect answer “meat” in line 2 made the lecturer reask the question with a clue (“beef is from the cow. From the sheep?”). Again, he rephrased his elicitation and switched into L1 to help students understand. Hence, rephrasing question and clue was applied in this exchange so that the students can give correct words which were then followed up by the lecturer's positive feedback. It appeared in lecturer's

comment “Lamb. It is lamb” where he repeated the whole students’ utterance (Hadley, 2010).

- 4.3 T: **Yes. What’s that mean?** (I)
 Ss: (Silence)
 T: Wilda, what’s that mean? (Ib)
 Sf: (Silence)
 T: Safira? (Ib)
 Sf: (Silence)
 T: Yusrizal? (Ib)
 Sf: (Silence)
 T: (The lecturer wrote “hitchhiker” on the white board). What’s that mean? What does this mean? (Ib)
 Ss: The people that..aaa...*gonceng*... the people who needs *tumpangan*. (R)
 T: Yes, somebody who needs a lift to go somewhere. There is a hitchhiker with thumb outstretched. **What does it mean?** (F/I)

Bound initiation in this extract involved repetition, nomination and clue that lead to correct answer (Yu, 2009). Nominating students appears in line 3, 5 and 7 where the lecturer asked the question to different students. Restatement of the question is raised in line 2 (“What does this mean?”). Also, because of no answer, clue was provided by writing “hitchhiker” on the whiteboard. This act successfully got students’ response (line 11) and he evaluated it with recast type of feedback which is implicit reformulation on students’ error or providing correction without directly pointing out that their utterance was incorrect (Coskun, 2010). These features were highly needed in encouraging students to speak.

To conclude, the combination of IRF pattern with bound initiation (Ib) in eliciting exchange describes lecturers’ effort to make students’ speak in speaking class by rephrasing the question, moving to another student, and giving clues. These acts were very important in speaking class. This was drawn from interview result with a lecturer:

“I will wait. I believe that for ESL students it is important to give time as much as possible for them to understand what I am saying. So I will wait whether they understand my command or not. If I still can not see that they are understand my...my...my instruction, I will ask another students. That’s why I ask them to

sit in groups so they can help each other. Why only 5 in a group for example, only one or two can receive my...my instruction. So others can ask help. And aaa when they can't really understand what I am telling, I will try to rephrase it, and when they still can't understand, I will try...I will try to aaa you know involve some kind of body language. And for last...translate it".

Next, another interview also reveal that the lecturer said "Okay, basically. We reformulated with another words, with another example, just to motivate them to find a new word". Hence, these features are needed to appear when getting no or incorrect response so that students will be motivated to speak.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The pattern of elicitation consists of IRF original model and modification with bound initiation (reformulating or repeating question, nomination, and clues). Elicitation is important in developing students' speaking skill. Therefore, lecturers should be more aware of using it for their speaking improvemnet. Some important points including feedback, nomination, clear voice, and a wait-time need to be implemented for succesfull elicitation. Various techniques of elicitation other than questions like body language, gap sentence, strategic pausing should be utilized to elicit students' talk.

WH-questions should be exploited more often to which students can give long answer instead of short yes/no response. Thus, it opens more opportunities for them to use and practice their English speaking. Additionally, the lecturers or teachers should consider a wait-time to give students a space to think and reformulate their responses when getting no answer. Thus, nominating, rephrasing questions, and clue are needed to elicit again instead of telling them the correct response or answering own questions. Hence, every turns which is essential for language development can be evaluated and make improvement in the next lesson. They should also have greater awarenes of feedback and evaluation.

REFERENCES

Alsubaie, S. (2015). *An analysis of classroom discourse: Elicitation techniques in EFL classroom*. Retrieved January 12, 2017 from <http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/An-Analysis-of->

Classroom-Discourse-Elicitation-Techniques-in-EFL-Classrooms.pdf.

- Al-Garawi, B. (2005). *A review of two approaches to L2 classroom interaction*. Retrived February 20, 2016 from http://www.tesol.org/docs/defaultsource/books/14022_classroom-interaction_sample.pdf?sfvrsn=2.
- Butterfield, J. L., & Bhatta, B. (2015). IRF sequences in team-teaching EFL classrooms. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(3), 176-185.
- Case, A. (2009). *The advantages and disadvantages of eliciting in the EFL classroom*. Retrieved March 10, 2016 form <http://www.usingenglish.com/teachers/articles/advantages-disadvantageseliciting-in-efl-classroom.html>.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chitravelu, N., Sithamparan, S., & Choon, T. S. (2005). *ELT methodology: Principle and practice*. Selangor: Fajar Bakti.
- Coskun, A. (2010). *A classroom research study on oral correction*. Retrieved March 10, 2016 from <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/jun10/sart05.htm>.
- Dailey, A. (2010). *An analysis of classroom discourse: The usefulness of Sinclair and Coulthard's rank scale in a language classroom*, Retrieved February 19, 2017 from <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/csdp>.
- Darn, S. (2009). *Eliciting*. Retrieved April 4, 2016 from <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/eliciting>.
- Delvia, S., Jufri, & Yuli, T. (2013). *An analysis of teachers' elicitation techniques in the classroom at SMA pembangunan laboratorium UNP*. Retrieved January 12, 2017 from <http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1283&context=wpel>.
- Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2012) *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadley, G. (2010). *An analysis of questioning and feedback strategies using the IRF framework*. Retrieved February 20, 2016 from <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/collegeartslaw/cels/essays/language-teaching/M1Paperdurey.pdf>.
- Harahap, H. S. (2010). *Elicitation and feedback in English classroom interaction in Biology teaching in the international standard class*

- of State Senior High School 1 Medan*. Retrieved March 14, 2016 from <http://digilib.unimed.ac.id/public/UNIMED-Master-1146-072188330015%20bab%20II.pdf>.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*: Fourth Edition. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Jafari, J. (2014). *The role of elicitation questions in language learning: A function-based framework*. Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing.
- Jones, S. (2009). *Application of the Sinclair and Coulthard discourse model to a Korean university English conversation*. Retrieved February 24, 2017 from <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/collegeartslaw/cels/essays/csdp/JonesSD.pdf>.
- Luoma, S. (1999). *Assessing speaking: Cambridge language assessment series*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1992). *Analisis data kualitatif*. Jakarta: UI Press.
- Nathan, M. J., & Kim, S. (2007). *Regulation of teacher elicitation and the impact on student participation and cognition*. Retrieved November 8, 2015 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/>.
- Nicholson, S.J. (2014). *An impetus for change: Classroom analysis using sinclair and coulthard's model of spoken discourse*. Retrieved February 24, 2017 from http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ijl/article/view/5464/pdf_86.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.
- Pearson, T. (2016). *The structure of L2 classroom interaction*. Retrieved July 7, 2017 from <http://docplayer.net/21089709-The-structure-of-l2-classroom-interaction.html>.
- Ramiro, S. R. (2002). *The significance of certain prosodic feature in the discourse of the teacher in EFL classroom*. Retrieved March 22, 2016 from <http://www.cvc.cervantes.es>.
- Richards, J. C., & Nunan, D. (1990). *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrel, T. S. C. (2011). *Practice teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Scrivener, J. (2012). *Classroom management techniques*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Syauqi. (2011). *Teaching speaking by using games*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Syiah Kuala University: Darussalam, Banda Aceh.
- Thornburry, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tsui, A. B. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction*. London: Penguin Books.
- Waring, H. Z. (2009). *Moving out of IRF (initiation-response-feedback): A single case analysis*. Retrieved January 12, 2017 from [http://www.tc.columbia.edu/faculty/tesolal/Waring%20\(2009\).pdf](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/faculty/tesolal/Waring%20(2009).pdf).
- Yu, W. (2009). *An analysis of college English classroom discourse*. Retrieved March 10, 2016 from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ass/article/viewFile/2984/2751>.